Article - Criminal Procedure

[Previous][Next]

§7–106.

- (a) For the purposes of this title, an allegation of error is finally litigated when:
- (1) an appellate court of the State decides on the merits of the allegation:
 - (i) on direct appeal; or
- (ii) on any consideration of an application for leave to appeal filed under § 7-109 of this subtitle; or
- (2) a court of original jurisdiction, after a full and fair hearing, decides on the merits of the allegation in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus or a writ of error coram nobis, unless the decision on the merits of the petition is clearly erroneous.
- (b) (1) (i) Except as provided in subparagraph (ii) of this paragraph, an allegation of error is waived when a petitioner could have made but intelligently and knowingly failed to make the allegation:
 - 1. before trial;
 - 2. at trial;
- 3. on direct appeal, whether or not the petitioner took an appeal;
- 4. in an application for leave to appeal a conviction based on a guilty plea;
- 5. in a habeas corpus or coram nobis proceeding began by the petitioner;
 - 6. in a prior petition under this subtitle; or
 - 7. in any other proceeding that the petitioner began.

- (ii) 1. Failure to make an allegation of error shall be excused if special circumstances exist.
- 2. The petitioner has the burden of proving that special circumstances exist.
- (2) When a petitioner could have made an allegation of error at a proceeding set forth in paragraph (1)(i) of this subsection but did not make an allegation of error, there is a rebuttable presumption that the petitioner intelligently and knowingly failed to make the allegation.
- (c) (1) This subsection applies after a decision on the merits of an allegation of error or after a proceeding in which an allegation of error may have been waived.
- (2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, an allegation of error may not be considered to have been finally litigated or waived under this title if a court whose decisions are binding on the lower courts of the State holds that:
- (i) the Constitution of the United States or the Maryland Constitution imposes on State criminal proceedings a procedural or substantive standard not previously recognized; and
- (ii) the standard is intended to be applied retrospectively and would thereby affect the validity of the petitioner's conviction or sentence.

[Previous][Next]